UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,567	08/07/2003	Takashi Isoda	03500.013663.1	9850

5514 7590 05/09/2006

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER	
VU, VIET DUY	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/635,567	ISODA, TAKASHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Viet Vu	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 August 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/357,976.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/03*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Non-Art Rejections:

1. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co., 151 U.S. 186 (1894); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Ockert, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

2. Claims 3, 13 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1, 11 and 3 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,665,719. This is a double patenting rejection.

3. The following non-statutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy

so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the right to exclude granted by a patent. In re Sarett, 327 F2.d 1005, 140 USPQ 474 (CCPA 1964); In re Schneller, 397 F2.d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968); In re White, 405 F2.d 904, 160 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); In re Thorington, 418 F2.d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); In re Vogel, 422 F2.d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); In re Van Ornam, 686 F2.d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1970); In re Longi, 759 F2.d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and In re Goodman, 29 USPQ 2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(b) would overcome an actual or provisional rejection on this ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 C.F.R. 1.78(d).

4. Claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-22 and 24-30 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting as being unpatentable over prior U.S. Patent No. 6,665,719.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentable distinct from each other because the prior art claims contains all limitations cited in present broader claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-22 and 24-30.

Art Rejections:

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (e) the invention was described in—
>
> (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
> (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

6. Claims 1, 5-6, 9-11, 15-16, 19-21, 25-26 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by French et al, U.S. pat. No. 6,341,312.

French discloses a method and system for providing a persistent communication between a client and a network device, e.g., printer, comprising:

a) a lower layer (34, fig. 2) for providing communication between the client and the network device (see col 3, lines 52-54);

b) an upper layer for maintaining persistent session between the client and the network device (see col 3, lines 65-67 and col 5, lines 25-42);

c) a code/controller for permitting the upper layer to maintain the persistent session for a predetermined period of time when the communication at lower layer is temporarily disconnected, and for permitting the upper layer continue to transmit data once the communication at the lower layer is reconnected (see col 6, lines 8-27).

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 2, 4, 7-8, 12, 14, 17-18, 24 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over French in view of Walker, U.S., pat. No. 5,867,636.

Per claims 2 and 4, French's teachings are still applied as discussed above. French does not explicitly teach setting and monitoring elapsed time. The use of timeouts to terminate a communication is well known in the art. For instance, Walker discloses a communication protocol in which a session request will be terminated if the server response time exceeds a predetermined time limit (see Walker's col 6, line 66 - col 7, line 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify French's invention with any conventional timer because it would have enabled setting timeout limits for the communication sessions.

Per claims 7-8, it would have been further obvious to one skilled in the art to implement French's invention with any known types of data bus or networks.

Claims 12, 14, 17-18, 24 and 27-28 are similar in scope as that of claims 2, 4 and 7-8 and hence are rejected for the same rationale set forth above for claims 2, 4 and 7-8.

10. Claims 3, 13 and 23 are not rejected on arts.

Conclusion:

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Viet Vu whose telephone number is 571-272-3977. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:00am to 4:00pm. The Group general information number is 571-272-2100. The Group fax number is 571-273-8300.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee, can be reached on 571-272-3964.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit 2154
5/5/06